

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7214

JOHN PATRICK MCSHEFFREY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KATHLEEN HAWK-SAWYER, Director, Federal Bureau
of Prisons; MARGARET C. HAMBRICK, Regional
Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons; MARK A.
HENRY, Warden; G. L. BOGDAN, Warden; W. C.
HENDERSON, Associate Warden; S. L. CRUMP, D
Unit Manager; S. GREASER, D2 Case Manager; D.
HUFFMAN, D2 Counsellor; D. COMLEY, Teacher; M.
KEGG, Education; D. TAYLOR, Acting Lieutenant;
A. THOMPSON, Lieutenant,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (CA-99-
2522-AMD)

Submitted: August 24, 2000

Decided: August 28, 2000

Before MICHAEL and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Patrick McSheffrey, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

John Patrick McSheffrey appeals the district court's order dismissing as frivolous his action filed under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find that this appeal is without merit. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See McSheffrey v. Hawk-Sawyer, No. CA-99-2522-AMD (D. Md. Aug. 26, 1999).^{*} We further deny McSheffrey's motion for summary reversal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on August 25, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on August 26, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).